

**Joint Village/Town Negotiation Committee Minutes**  
**June 27, 2012**

Town representatives present: Keith Seward, Bob Elkins and Gof Thomson

Village representatives present: Jim Salter, and Dan Gartzke

Absent: Kevin Budsberg

Also in attendance: Village Administrator Nicholas Owen and Mark Roffers

1. Call to Order - Meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chair Jim Salter.
2. Announcement: All cell phones are to remain silent during the meeting.
3. Approval of Agenda: Motion by D. Gartzke to approve the agenda as presented, second by J. Salter. Motion carried.
4. Approval of Minutes of 5/30/12 Meeting: Motion by K. Seward to approve the minutes as presented, second by D. Gartzke. Motion carried.
5. Review/Recommendation: Draft #3 of Cooperative Plan: M. Roffers noted that he has met with K. Seward, N. Owen and DOA Staff. The DOA had minor suggestions and areas of clarification. The changes and suggestions have been combined into the June 15<sup>th</sup> Draft.

**Town Response June 27, 2012**

Reference CBA: Committee Review Draft #3 dated June 15, 2012

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Page #</u>	<u>Line #</u>	<u>Section</u>
1.	2	35	2.

Comments-Sentence needs a starting date as well as ending date. Starting date is "Date of Wis. DOA approval." Without objection Mark will make that explicit with the DOA and will list the date on the footer of the document.

2.	3	11	3
----	---	----	---

Comments- Delete Same outer boundary as the Village/Town extraterritorial zoning area, reflected on map in Exhibit 5, except that the Planning Area extends further east than the extraterritorial zoning area, out to the eastern limits of the Town, and add "Planning Area follows existing property lines, section lines, quarter section lines, quarter/quarter section lines or other easily recognizable boundaries such as creek beds or center lines of roads." M. Roffers handed out suggested language to add to the end of Section 3, Territory Subject to the Cooperative Plan. The consensus of the group was they like the wording, Roffers will tighten the language and will incorporate with the public hearing version.

K. Seward moved that this group approve the map as presented, R. Elkins 2<sup>nd</sup>. M. Roffers will clarify borders and will provide rational for the location of the planning area boundary depicted on exhibit 1. Motion carried.

3.	3	25	4
----	---	----	---

Comments-Add an "s" to "provide" - Change without objection.

4. 4 25 4E  
Comments: Add “it after that - Change without objection.

5. 4 30, 31 4E  
Comments: Whose desire, owners or Towns? Language is confusing. M. Roffers explained that section 4 is goal orientated. Without objection, M. Roffers will edit the statement to read “*Further, this Plan limits the Village annexation of Town lands without property owner consent as described in this Cooperative Plan.*” (Language subject to Town Council review.)

6. 5 15 6  
Comments-Under Town’s proposed Planning Area Map, Valley View would not be in planning area. (See Exhibit 1, 6/27/12 Map)(Add areas A & B) Acceptance by planning area map.

7. 6 14 & 15 7B  
Comments-Define, “above agricultural transition zoning limitations” Defined on page 7 lines 24-35. Without objection, M. Roffers will relocate the definition at the beginning. He may also simplify the definition of “Above”.

8. 7 13-15 7B4 & side comment M3  
Comments: Language stays, add notes to CSM or Plat in addition (Per D.H.) Without objection the language will be included in agreement as well as the CSM and/or Plat.

9. 7 23 plus 7B6a  
Comments-If adopted, (refer to the definition New Residential) - does a cluster development built during the Plan Period require being re-zoned? Without objection, M. Roffers will add the clarifying language from Page 9 lines 15-18 to this section. M. Roffers may also italicize or capitalize all words of the definition.

10. 8 6-9 7C1  
Comments-Explain what this would mean if adopted. M. Roffers explained this is a statement of intent. K. Seward noted that it will be incumbent on the Town Plan Commission to stress annexation possibilities.

11. 8 10-16 7C2  
Comments-Does “may” mean Town & owner approval? Without objection the language will read “may at the Village’s option.”

12. 8 40-41 & next page  
Comments-See item 7 & 9. Also, does “may” mean a veto? Also page 9 line 2, delete “or Village ordinance.” Clarify that this is outside the

contract period, and after the property would have been annexed to the Village.

13. 9 14-18 7C6a  
Comments - Clarify. Perhaps this answers Items 9. Without objection, M. Roffers will add similar language found in item 9.

14. 9 36 7D1  
Comments - Without objection, delete "Still".

Without objection the Village agrees to page 10, item 3, lines 14-15, M5. Nic clarified that this can be accomplished by amending their Charter.

15. 12 32 Comment M6  
Comments: Discussion. After a brief discussion, the language will be left as is.

16. 14 9-11 9A3  
Comments-Are these dollars invested by the appropriate utility and reimbursed via the utility rate? Nic clarified that road monies come from the levy whereas utilities come from utilities.

17. 14 14-16 9A4  
Comments-Justification? Without object this section will be sticken.

18. 14-15 40 9C3  
Comments-Ditto, see answer 16.

19. 15 3-5 9C4  
Comments-Justification? Ditto, see answer #16.

20. 15 37-39 9E3  
Comments-Town Permit required when road openings are necessary. Emergency situations are covered in permit procedure. Without objection M. Roffers will clarify when a Town Road opening permit is required.

21. 16 8-9 9E5  
Comments-Shouldn't we include cable & telephone services? Without objection substitute WE Energies with private utilities and service providers.

22. 16 & 17 34-37 & 1-23 9GG2  
Comments-May have to wait for Town Engineer's comments. This is an added issue not previously discussed. K. Seward noted that he met with the Town Engineer and without objection M. Roffers and K. Seward will define the Paser Rating. The Town will pay for work when completed by the Village.

23. 23 10,11 14D  
Comments-Delete “and the Village.” We do not believe it is necessary to require Village approval of our Impact fee needs assessment. The Village agrees to this deletion.

24. 23 13 14D  
Comments-Must add language that addresses changes by litigation or statute requiring refunds of Impact Fees. Without objection, K. Seward will verify with Town Council about statute of limitations.

25. 23 25 14E  
Comments-Ditto Item 23. The Village agrees to this deletion.

26. 23 29 14E  
Comments-Ditto Item 24. The Village agrees to this deletion.

27. 25 1 16C  
Comments-Add, after shall, “pay for and” Without objection, the Village agrees to this.

6. Discussion/Recommendation: CBA Exhibit 1 – Exterior Boundary of Planning Area: see above.

7. Discussion/Recommendation: CBA Section 7 – Boundary Changes Mandated and Permitted During the Planning Period: see above.

Discussion/Recommendation: CBA Section 9 – Extension of Utility Services: The town would like clarification on why a 25% surcharge would be required for the extension of water and sewer to properties outside the Village. Administrator Owen will work to clarify the issue for the next meeting.

8. Discussion/Recommendation: Next Steps in Cooperative Plan Preparation Process: Public Hearing August 16 @ 6:30 at the Village Hall. Each board will add discussion item of the Cooperative Plan to their board meetings prior to the Public Hearing.

Both the Town and Village need to review the recommended amendments to the Comprehensive Plans. Class 1 notice with the public hearing taking place in September before you adopt the Cooperative Plan. Without objection, M. Roffers will draft the changes to present to each parties legal review. M. Roffers will prepare a work order for signature.

9. Set Next Meeting Date and Agenda Items: The next meeting is scheduled for August 16<sup>th</sup>, 2012 to follow the public hearing to discuss any further issues.

10. Adjournment: Motion by D. Gartzke to adjourn, second by R. Elkins. Motion carried at 8:55 p.m.

Patricia I. Salter, Clerk-Treasurer  
Town of New Glarus